



A

DEFENCE

Of the late

Lord BOLLINGBROKE's Letters &c.

7



1755

DEFENCE

A
D E F E N C E
Of the late
Lord BOLLINGBROKE's
L E T T E R S
ON the
Study and Use of *History*.

By M. V O L T A I R E.

Translated from the French.



L O N D O N :

Printed for J. Nourse, opposite Katherine-street in the Strand. 1753.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
MAY, 28, 1913
SUBSCRIPTION FOR
ENGLISH HISTORICAL TRACTS

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE reader will please to observe, that
in the following piece M. VOLTAIRE
assumes the character of a protestant,
having published the original under
a fictitious name.



LONDON.

Printed for J. Nourse, opposite Ks-
theatre, in the Strand, 1752.

A
D E F E N C E

Of the late

Lord BOLLINGBROKE's Letters &c.

IT is a duty incumbent on every man, to defend the memory of persons eminent in rank and merit. We shall therefore undertake the cause of the late lord BOLLINGBROKE, who has been grossly insulted in some periodical papers, on the account of his excellent letters published since his decease. In one of those journals it is said, *that his name ought to have no weight in matters of religion and morality.* With regard to morality, I cannot help thinking, but that the noble lord who furnished the admirable Mr. POPE with the first principles of his

Essay on man, must be. beyond all doubt, the greatest master of wisdom and morality, that ever existed. And as to religion, he has never touched upon the subject, but as a person thoroughly versed in history and philosophy. He was so modest as to confine himself to the historical part, which is open to the inquiry of the learned; and in all probability, if those who have wrote against him with such acrimony, had well examined what the noble vicount has said, what he might have said, as well as what he has omitted saying, they would have shewn more respect to his memory. As my lord BOLLINGBROKE did not think proper to enter into any theological discussions concerning MOSES; we shall follow his example in the following defence.

BUT

BUT previously it will be proper to remark, that faith is the firmest support of christianity, and that it is faith alone which induces us to give credit to the stories related in the Pentateuch. If we were obliged to cite those books before the tribunal of pure reason, would it be possible ever to determine the disputes they have raised? Can reason explain, how the serpent spoke in the days of old, how he seduced the mother of mankind, how BALAAM's ass spoke to her master, and so many other things that are set out of the reach of our weak and imperfect knowledge? Does not that prodigious crowd of miracles, succeeding each other with such rapidity, astonish and surprise the human understanding? Is it possible for us to comprehend, when left to the feeble light of our own understandings,

how the *Egyptian* priests should have worked the same prodigies as MOSES, who was sent by the true GOD; for example, that they should have turned all the waters of *Egypt* into blood, after MOSES had made this amazing transmutation? And what philosophy is capable of explaining how the *Egyptian* priests could have found water to change into blood, after MOSES had already made this strange metamorphosis?

AND indeed, if we had no other guide than the weak and glimmering light of human reason, there are few pages in the pentateuch that we could give our assent to, according to the rules established by men, to judge of human affairs. Besides, all the world allows that it is impossible to reconcile the confused chronology, which prevails through this whole book; they
allow

allow also that the sacred geography in many places is inaccurate. The names of some cities which we find in those writings, and which were not so called till a long time after, create a vast deal of perplexity, notwithstanding the great pains some commentators have taken to expound such difficult passages. When my lord BOLLINGBROKE applied the rules of criticism to the books of the Pentateuch, it was not his intent to shake the foundations of religion; and indeed, this was his very reason for separating the dogmatical part from the historical, with such care and circumspection, as deserves greatly the commendations of those who have attempted to decry him. This great genius has in some measure disarmed his adversaries, by separating faith from reason, which is the only way to terminate all these disputes. Several learned men before him,

him, and especially father SIMON, were of his opinion, declaring that it was of very little signification, whether MOSES himself was the author of Genesis and Exodus, or whether the priests in succeeding times collected the traditions left by the jewish legislator. It suffices that we believe these books with an humble and submissive faith, without precisely knowing the author, to whom God alone did visibly inspire them, to confound human reason.

THE adversaries of the great man, whose cause we have espoused, tell us, *that it is as clearly proved that MOSES is the author of the Pentateuch, as that HOMER wrote the Iliad.* They will give me leave to answer them, that the comparison is not just. HOMER in his Iliad does not mention any fact that happened a long time after his death.

death. He does not call towns and provinces by names which they were not known by in his time. It is therefore evident, that if we were to be directed only by the rules of profane criticism, we should have reason to presume that HOMER is the author of the Iliad, but not that MOSES wrote the Pentateuch. Nothing but an implicit submission to religion, removes all these difficulties; and I see no reason why my lord BOLLINGBROKE, who professed the same subjection to that religion as any other person, should have been so virulently attacked.

THEY pretend to be sorry that he never read ABBADIE. But who is it they thus reproach? A man who had read almost every thing; nay a man who quotes this very author. (1)

(1) See the first volume of his letters on the study and use of history, printed by MILLAR. p. 94.

I own he had a great contempt for ABBADIE ; but it must also be agreed, that ABBADIE was not a writer to be put in competition with my lord BOLLINGBROKE. Sometimes he defends the sacred truths of religion with the arms of imposture. He had particular notions, which are judged erroneous in regard to the Trinity; and in fine, he died raving mad in *Dublin*.

THEY also reproach the noble viscount with not having read the abbe HOUTEVILLE's book, intituled, *Religion proved by facts*. I knew this abbe HOUTEVILLE : he lived many years with a farmer of the king's revenues, who had a very pretty seraglio. He was afterwards secretary to the famous cardinal du Bois, who refused to receive the sacraments at his death, and whose life is well known to the public. He dedicated his book to cardinal

nal

nald'Auvergne, who was created abbot of *Cluni propter clunes*. I was then at *Paris*, where they made themselves very merry, both with the book and the dedication; and it is beyond all doubt, that the objections in that book against the christian religion; happen very unfortunately to be stronger than the answers; which has made a fatal impression, on the generality of sensible readers, the effects of which we daily see, to our great grief and concern.

My lord BOLLINGBROKE says, that christianity has been a long time upon the decline. But do not his adversaries say the very same thing? Do not they complain of it every day? And here we shall take the liberty to tell them for their own good, as well as for that of the common cause, that it is not by invectives, nor by contumelious speeches

es, interlarded with wretched arguments, they must expect to convince the understandings of those who are so unfortunate as to be incredulous. Abusive language shocks all mankind, and conveys no persuasion. It is too much the practice to bestow the opprobrious epithets of *dissolute and debauched*, on philosophers who should only be pitied for being mistaken in their opinions.

For example, my lord BOLLINGBROKE's adversaries treat him as a debauchee, for communicating his thoughts on history to my lord CORNBURY. I cannot see what relation this charge has to his book. If a person in the midst of a seraglio was to write in favour of fornication, or an usurer in defence of usury, or an APICIUS upon good living, or a tyrant or rebel against the institution of laws,

such

such men as those would, no doubt, deserve to be told, that their writings were only a copy of their morals : but a statesman, like my lord BOLLINGBROKE, living in a philosophical retirement, and generously opening his vast store of literature, to improve the understanding of a young nobleman worthy of his instruction, did not certainly merit, that men who ought to set an example of decency and good manners, should impute those writings, the product of close reasoning and profound study, to his youthful irregularities.

IN what case then is it allowed to charge a man with the disorders of his past life? Perhaps, only when his morals contradict his doctrine. There is no harm in comparing the sermons of a famous preacher in our days, with the robberies he committed upon my lord

GALL-

GALLWAY, and with his continued scene of intrigues and amours. There is no harm in comparing the sermons of a celebrated rector of the *Invalids*, and of FANTIN rector of *Versailles*, with the action brought against them for seducing and robbing their penitents. In fine, there is no harm in comparing the morals of so many popes and bishops, with the religion which they maintained by fire and sword. We might on one side set their robberies, their bastards, their assassinations; and on the other their bulls and mandates. On such occasions as these we may be allowed to deviate a little from that strict rule of charity, which enjoins us to conceal the faults of our brethren. But who is it that told the detractors of my lord BOLLINGBROKE, that he had a passion for women and wine? And even if he had any such passion, even if he had had

as many concubines as DAVID, SOLOMON, or the Grand *Turk*, what is all that in regard to the discovery of the real author of the Pentateuch ?

WE acknowledge that there are but too many deists ; and it is a melancholy consideration, that all parts of *Europe* abound with them. They are in the magistracy, in the army, in the church, near the throne, and even upon the throne itself. The republic of letters especially swarms with them ; for they fill almost every academy. Will it be said, that it is the spirit of debauchery, libertinism, and a lawless indulgence of the passions, that has united them in the same sentiments ? Shall we dare to speak of them with an affected air of contempt ? If they were so very contemptible, their adversaries would write against them with less rancour ; but there is reason to fear, that this

B

rancour

rancour, which is but too real, and these airs of contempt, which are all affected, will produce an effect quite contrary to what might naturally be expected, from a gentle and charitable zeal, supported by sound doctrine and true philosophy.

BUT why should we treat the deists, who are not idolaters, worse than the papists, whom we have charged with idolatry? We should hiss at a jesuit, who would pretend now to say, that it is libertinism which makes people protestants. We should laugh at a protestant, who was to tell us, that it is the corrupt morals of the papists, which induce them to go to mass. What right have we then to tell philosophers, who worship only one God, but go neither to mass nor meeting, that they are men of debauched lives?

It sometimes happens, that these zealots throw out their indecent abuse against persons, who indeed are so unhappy as to be mistaken, but whose life and conversation might serve as a pattern to those who attempt to vilify them. There are instances of writers of periodical papers, who have pushed their effrontery so far, as to point out in opprobrious terms, the most respectable as well as most potent personages in *Europe*. It is not long since we have seen a public paper, the writer of which transported by indiscreet zeal, or some other motive, falls into a strange kind of extravagance in railing against those who are of opinion, *that wise laws, military discipline, an equitable administration, and virtuous examples, are sufficient to govern mankind; and that the care of governing consciences ought to be left to God.* In this pamphlet,

a very great man was treated in disrespectful terms. He might have taken revenge of him as a man ; as a prince he might have punished him ; but he answered like a philosopher : *these wretches must certainly be convinced of our virtues, and especially of our indulgence, since they insult us thus, without fear and with such brutality.*

THIS answer ought to confound the author, whoever he was, who in defending the cause of christianity had recourse to such odious arms. We beseech our brethren, to render themselves amiable in order to render our religion amiable. And indeed, what can a wise prince, a grave magistrate, a philosopher who has spent his days in literary retirement, in short, all those who have been so unfortunate as to have been induced to embrace deism by the specious arguments of a deceitful

ful philosophy, what can they think, when they see such a swarm of pamphlets, in which they are treated as persons whose heads are full of chimerical notions, as *petits maitres*, as good jesters and bad livers? Let us take heed, lest they be confirmed in their sentiments by the contempt and indignation, which those writings must naturally inspire.

To these considerations we may add a new motive. It is that this crowd of deists with which *Europe* is overstocked, are a great deal nearer receiving the truths of our religion, than adopting the dogma's of the *Roman* communion. They all acknowledge that our religion is more agreeable to reason and sense, than that of the papists. Let us not remove them farther from us, we who alone are capable of bringing them back into the

right way. They worship one God, and so do we ; they inculcate the principles of virtue, and so do we. They would have us be subject to the higher powers, to treat all mankind as our brethren ; we think in this respect as they do, and we both set out with the same principles. Let us then behave towards them as relations that have the family deeds in their hands, and are ready to produce them to those, who only know that they are descended from the same stock, and have the same progenitors, but cannot shew any of the family writings.

A DEIST is a man who is of the religion of ADAM, SEM, and NOAH. So far he agrees with us. Let us say to him : you have only one step to make from the religion of NOAH to the precepts given to ABRAHAM. From the religion of ABRAHAM proceed to that
of

of MOSES. Quit immediately the religion of MOSES for that of the Messiah. In fine, when you have seen that the religion of the Messiah has been corrupted, you must chuse from among WICLIFF, LUTHER, JOHN HUSS, CALVIN, MELANCHTHON, OECOLAMPADIUS, ZWINGLIUS, STORCK, PARKER, SERVETUS, SOCINUS, FOX, and other reformers. Thus you will have a clue which will guide you in this great labyrinth from the creation of the world till the year 1752. If he should answer that he has examined all those great men, and that he had rather be of the religion of SOCRATES, PLATO, TRAJAN, MARCUS AURELIUS, CICERO, PLINY, &c. we ought to pity him; we ought to pray that God may enlighten him; but we should not abuse him. We do not abuse the Mahometans, nor the disciples of CONFUCIUS. We do not rail

against the *Jews* themselves though they crucified our God; on the contrary we converse with them, and grant them extraordinary privileges. What reason have we then to declaim so furiously against those who worship one God in conjunction with the Mahometans, the *Chinese*, the *Jews*, and us, but do not adopt our theology no more than those nations?

It is easy to conceive how there came to be such terrible outcries at a time when on the one hand there was a public sale of indulgences and benefices, and on the other bishops were dispossessed, and monasteries plundered. Such disputes as those must end in a torrent of blood. The point was to maintain, or to subvert a power usurped over the liberties of mankind. But we do not find that either my lord BOLINGBROKE, my lord SHAFTSBURY,
or

or the celebrated Mr. POPE who has consigned the principles of those two noble writers to immortality, have attempted to meddle with the livings of any of the ministers of the gospel, JURIEU indeed caused BAYLE to be deprived of his pension ; but the great BAYLE never so much as thought of diminishing JURIEU's income. Let us therefore live in peace. Let us preach as pure a morality as that of the philosophers worshippers of one GOD, who agreeing with us upon this grand principle, teach the same virtues as we, concerning which there is no dispute ; but do not teach the same dogmas which have been disputed these seventeen hundred years, and are likely so to continue.

or the celebrated Mr. Foxe who has
 assigned the principles of these two
 noble writers to immortality, have at-
 tempted to reconcile with the things of
 any of the ministers of the gospel, Ju-
 risprudence could BAYE to be deprive
 ed of his position, but the great BAYE
 never so much as thought of diminishing
 Jurisprudence. Let us therefore
 live in peace. Let us preach as pure a
 morality as that of the philosophers
 worshippers of one God, who agree-
 ing with us upon this grand principle,
 teach the same virtues as we, concern-
 ing which there is no dispute, but do
 not teach the same dogmas which have
 been disputed these seventeen hundred
 years, and are likely to continue.

THE
DIATRIBA
OF
DOCTOR AKAKIA,
The POPE's Phyfician ;
The Decree of the INQUISITION,
AND
The Report of the Profeflors of
ROME in regard to a pretended
PRESIDENT.

R O M E, MDCCLIII.

THE
DIATRIBA
OF
DOCTOR AKAKIA

The Pope's Physician ;

The Decree of the Inquisition,

and

The Report of the Professors of
Rome in regard to a pretended
President.

R O M E. M D C C L I I I .

THE
DIATRIBA
OF
DOCTOR AKAKIA,

The POPE's Phyfician.

NOTHING is more common now a days than young ignorant authors, who publish under illustrious names, works very unworthy of seeing the public light. There are quacks of all kinds. But here we have a special one, who has assumed the name of President of a celebrated academy, to vend his extraordinary drugs. It is beyond all doubt, that the respectable president is not the author of the books attributed to him; for this admirable philosopher, who

has discovered that nature always acts by the simplest laws, and who so sagely adds, that in all her operations she is directed by the principles of oeconomy, would have saved the few readers, capable of understanding him, the trouble of reading the same thing twice over in a book intituled *his works*, and that which goes by the name of *his letters*. A third at least of one of his volumes is copied word for word from the other. This great man, so averse to quackery, would not have imposed fictitious letters on the public, and especially would not have fallen into some small mistakes, which none but a young man could be guilty of.

I VERILY believe, as much as it is possible for me to believe, that I am not biaſſed in the following diſcourſe by the private views of my profeſſion. But I hope to be excuſed, if I find it
a little

a little hard that this writer should treat the physicians like booksellers; for he pretends to make us starve. He would not have physicians to be paid their fee, when unluckily the patient does not recover. There is no one, he says, pays a painter that has drawn a bad picture. O young man, how hard and unjust thou art! Did not the duke of ORLEANS, regent of *France*, give a most magnificent price for the dawbing with which COIPEL pretended to adorn the gallery of *Palais Royal*? Does a client refuse to pay his attorney's just demand, because he lost his cause? A physician promises his care, but not a certain cure: he uses his best endeavours; and he is paid for his attendance. And would you then be so unreasonable as to be jealous of none but physicians?

I SHOULD

I SHOULD be glad to know what answer a man would make, that, for example, had an annual pension of twelve hundred ducats for chattering about mathematics and metaphysics, for dissecting two or three toads, and for having his picture drawn in his doctor's robe and furred cap; if the treasurer was to speak to him thus: Sir, we shall cut off a hundred ducats from your salary, for having wrote that the stars are made like mill stones; a hundred ducats more for telling us, that a comet shall some day or another come and *rob* us of our moon, and perhaps carry *its bold designs* against the sun itself; one hundred more for imagining that comets *made of gold and diamonds* shall fall to the ground. You are fined three hundred ducats for asserting that children are formed by attraction in their mother's womb,

womb, that the left eye attracts the right leg, &c. We cannot take off less than four hundred ducats for pretending to know the nature of the soul by the means of opium, and by dissecting the heads of giants, &c. &c. It is evident that the poor philosopher would, at the end of the account, lose his whole pension. Would he be then pleased that we physicians should laugh at him, and should declare that rewards belong only to those whose writings are of public utility, and not to such as are known to the world only by the singular vanity of desiring to be known?

THIS thoughtless young man blames my fellow members of the faculty for not being sufficiently enterprizing. He pretends that we are indebted to mere accident, and to savage nations, for the only specifics known to the world, and that the physicians never discovered

C

any.

any. But it is proper to inform him, that experience is the only mistress of man in discovering the salubrious virtues of herbs and plants. HIPPOCRATES. BOERHAAVE, CURAC, and SENAC, would never surely have guessed, merely by seeing the Jesuits bark, that it could cure the fever, nor from the sight of rhubarb that it had a purging quality, nor of poppies that they were soporiferous. What is commonly called *chance or accident*, is the only means that can lead us to the discovery of the properties of plants; and the physicians can do no more than prescribe the remedies suitable to the occasion. They invent a great many medicines by the help of chemistry; they do not pretend to infallibility, but they pretend to use their best endeavours to ease and assist mankind. I would fain know whether the young spark who makes so free
with

with the faculty, has ever done such service to mankind, as he who unexpectedly rescued Marshal *Saxe* from the jaws of death after the battle of *Fontenoy*.

OUR young Logician pretends that physicians should henceforward be only empirics, and advises them to banish all theory. What would you say of a man, who was for employing no architect to build his house, but only bricklayers and masons to jumble the stones together without order or design?

HE gives also a very wise advice to neglect the study of anatomy. Here for once we shall have the surgeons on our side. We are only surprized that the author, who owns some small obligations to the surgeons of *Montpelier* in disorders which required a large share of knowledge in regard to the inward structure of the head, and some other parts of anatomy, shews so little gratitude to those gentlemen.

THE same author seems so little versed in history, that mentioning the design of rendering the punishment of criminals of more use to the public, and of making experiments on their bodies, he says that this project was never carried into execution. Thus he shews his ignorance of what every body knows, *viz.* that in the reign of *Lewis XI.* the experiment of cutting for the stone was made for the first time in *France* on a condemned criminal; and that *Queen Anne* ordered the first essay of inoculating for the small pox on four convicts, not to mention several other instances of the like nature.

BUT if our author is wanting in knowledge, we must own he abundantly makes up the loss by the fertility of his imagination: he recommends in the quality of a physician, that we should make use of the centrifugal force to cure an apoplexy, and
whirl

whirl the patient about like a gig. The notion indeed is not originally his, but he has cloathed it in a new dress.

He advises us to dawb a sick man's body all over with pitch, or to pierce his skin with needles. If he should ever practise physick, and propose such methods of cure, it is more than probable that the patients will follow the advice he gives them of not paying the physician.

BUT what is very extraordinary, is, that this bitter enemy of the faculty, who is for lessening our fees thus without mercy, proposes by way of a lenitive, to ruin our patients. He ordains, for he is quite despotic, that every physician should attempt to cure only one infirmity, so that if a man is troubled with the gout, with a fever, with sore eyes, and a pain in his ear, he must see four physicians instead of one; but perhaps he intends also that we
should

should have each only the fourth part of our ordinary retribution. Now I see into his design: Shortly he will counsel the devotees to have directors for every vice, one for the serious ambition of toys, another for jealousy concealed under a rude and imperious air, another for the passion of caballing for mere trifles, another for stuff of the like nature. However, let us not digress from the subject, but return to our fellow members of the faculty.

THE best physician, he says, *is he who reasons least*. He seems to have adopted this axiom in philosophy, as much as father *Canaie* did in theology; and yet notwithstanding his aversion to reasoning, we see he has made profound meditations on the art of prolonging life. And in the first place he agrees with all men of sense, upon which we heartily congratulate him, that our forefathers lived to the age of eight or nine hundred years.

AF-

AFTERWARDS having found out by his own investigation, and independently of *Leibnitz*, that maturity is not the age of full strength, nor the age of manhood, but that this period is death; he proposes to put back this point of maturity, in the manner that eggs are preserved by hindering them from being hatched. A very fine secret! We counsel him to have the honour of this discovery secured to him in some hen-houses, or by the definitive sentence of some academy.

By this account it plainly appears, that if the imaginary letters were written by a president, he must certainly be no other than a president of *Bedlam*; and that beyond all manner of doubt, as we have already observed, they must come from the pen of a young man, who wanted to impose on the public by assuming the name of a sage, respected as every body knows, through-

out all Europe, and who has consented to be declared *a great man*. We have been at the carnival in *Italy*, where we have sometimes seen harlequin disguised in the habit of an archbishop; but harlequin was soon found out by the manner he gave his benediction. Sooner or later the cheat is known: this recalls to my memory one of *Fontaine's* fables.

*At length out popt a bit of ear,
By which the cheat did plain appear (1).*

But here we have the ears quite *intire*.

(8) *Un petit bout d'oreille échappé par malheur
Decouvrit la fourbe & l'erreur.*

Decree

Decree of the Inquisition of Rome.

WE Father *Pancrace*, and Inquisitor of the holy faith, have read the *Diatriba* of Monsignor *Akakia*, physician in ordinary to his holiness, without understanding the meaning of the word *Diatriba*, and we found nothing therein contrary to faith nor to the decretals. We cannot say the same of the works and letters of a young anonymous author, who has disguised himself under the name of a president.

AFTER invoking the holy Ghost, we have found in the works, that is in the quarto of the anonymous writer, a great many propositions, some temerarious, others ill-founding, others heretical, others bordering upon heresy, we therefore condemn them collectively, separately, and respectively.

PARTICULARLY and especially we anathematize the essay on Cosmology,
in

in which the anonymous writer, blinded by the principles of the sons of *Belial*, and accustomed to find fault with every thing, insinuates, contrary to the plain text of Scripture, that it is a fault of providence to let spiders catch flies; and in which Cosmology the author gives afterwards to understand, that there is no other proof of the existence of God, than in Z equal to BC divided by A plus B . Now these characters being taken from the conjuring book, and visibly diabolical, we declare them injurious to the authority of the *holy See*.

AND since, according to custom, we understand not one word of those matters which go by the name of physics, mathematics, dynamics, metaphysics, &c. we have given directions to the reverend professors of philosophy in the college of *Sapienza*, to examine the books and letters of the young anonymous writer, and to make a faith-

faithful report of them to us. So God
be their aid.—

*Judgment of the professors of the
college of Sapienza.*

1°. WE declare that the laws on the
collision of bodies, perfectly hard, are
puerile and imaginary, since there is
no such thing that we know of as a
body perfectly hard, except it be thick
sculls, on which we have in vain en-
deavoured to operate.

2°. THE assertion, *that the product
of space by velocity is always a minimum,*
appears to us false ; for the product is
sometimes a *maximum*, as LEIBNITZ
thought, and as it has been since de-
monstrated. It seems that the young
author borrowed only half of LEIB-
NITZ's idea ; and herein we discharge
him

him from the imputation of having taken the intire notion from LEIBNITZ.

3°. WE adhere moreover to the censure which monsignor AKAKIA, the pope's phyfician, and fo many others have made of the works of the young *Pseudonimus*, and efpecially of the *Venus Phifca*. We advife the young author, wherefoever he fhall proceed with his wife, if he has one, to the work of generation, not to imagine that the child is formed in the uterus by the means of attraction; and we exhort him, if ever he commit a fin of the flefh, not to envy the fet of fnails in generation, nor that of toads, and to imitate lefs FONTENELLE's ftile, when maturity of age fhall have formed his own.

WE fhall now examine the *letters*, which we have judged to contain, by a twofold and vicious ufe, almoft all that

that is in his works; and we exhort him not to vend the same commodity twice under different names, because this is not dealing as he ought, like a fair trader. vend

Examination of the Letters.

1°. IN the first place the young author should be told that *foreknowledge* is not called *prescience* in man; for the word *prescience* is applied only to the knowledge by which God sees future events. He should know the force of tempers, before he sits down to write. It is proper he should know that the soul does not *perceive* her self; she sees objects, but does not see her self; this is her natural state. The young writer might easily have corrected his mistakes.

2°. *WE must lose more than we gain by our memory.* The young student ought to

know that the memory is the faculty of retaining ideas, and that without this faculty, man could not make himself understood, nor hardly have any knowledge, or be capable of conducting himself in life, insomuch that he would be quite an idiot: the young man ought to consult his tutors on this subject.

3°. WE are obliged to declare the following notion ridiculous, namely, *that the soul is like a body restored to its natural state after having been agitated; and that thus the soul returns to her state of contentment or distress, which is her natural situation.* The young writer has explained himself here very ill. Probably he meant that every man returns to his natural character; that a man, for example, after having endeavoured to act the philosopher, returns to his ordinary weaknesses, &c. But such trivial truths ought not to be repeated: it is a mistake to which youth are incident

dent, to imagine that common things are capable of deriving the character of novelty from obscurity of expression.

4°. OUR young student is mistaken, when he says that extent is nothing but the perception of the soul. If ever he should fall into a right method of study, he will find that extent is not like sound and colours, which exist only in our sensations; but that it exists independently of our sensations, as a school-boy makes it to exist.

5°. WITH regard to the German nation, whom he undervalues, and treats in equivalent terms as a weak people, this appears to us both ungrateful and unjust. Nor is he only mistaken, he is defective in good breeding; perhaps he might have imagined he invented something after LEIBNITZ, but we shall tell this young man it
was

was not he that invented gunpowder.

6°. WE are afraid lest the author should inspire his fellow students with some slight inclination of searching after the philosopher's stone ; for he says, *in whatever light we consider it, we cannot prove the impossibility of it.* We acknowledge that he allows it to be a great folly to spend one's fortune in the pursuit ; but, as when he is speaking of the sum of happiness, he says that the Christian religion cannot be demonstrated, and yet great numbers of people make profession of it : by a much stronger reason a few persons might spend their estates in the pursuit of the great secret, since it is possible, according to him, to find it.

7°. We pass over several things in silence, which would tire the patience of the reader, and the understanding of the inquisitor ; but we think he
will

will be greatly surprized to hear that your young student wants absolutely to dissect the brains of giants twelve feet high, and habited like men, but wearing tails like quadrupeds, in order to dive into the nature of the human understanding ; that with opium and dreaming he modifies the brain ; that he can cause eels with or without spawn to be engendered by oatmeal and water, and other fish with grains of corn. This we mention only to divert the inquisitor.

8°. BUT his inquisitorial reverence will laugh no longer, when he hears that every man may become a prophet ; for the author finds no more difficulty in seeing future than past events. He acknowledges that the reasons in favour of judicial astrology, are as strong as those against it. Afterwards he affirms, that the perceptions of the time past, present, and future,

ture, differ only in the degree of the activity of the soul. He hopes that a little more *warmth* and *exalting* of the imagination will help to point out things to come, as the memory shews those that are past : we unanimously judge, that his brain is greatly exalted, and he is very near being a prophet. We do not know whether he will be a prophet in his own country, or whether he will be one of the greater or lesser prophets ; but we are afraid he will prophesy nothing that is good ; since in his treatise of happiness he speaks only of affliction ; particularly he says, that all fools are unhappy. To all those who are such, we pass a compliment of condolence ; but if his exalted soul has seen into futurity, has not she perceived a particular object of ridicule ?

9°. HE appears to have a desire of going to the *Terra Australis*, tho' upon reading his book one would be
tempted

tempted to think that he is come from thence ; and yet he does not seem to know any thing of the discovery long since made, of the land of *Frederic Henry*, situate beyond the fortieth degree of southern latitude. But we give him fair notice, that if instead of going to the *Terra Australis*, he has a mind to sail directly under the Arctic pole, he shall embark by himself. He ought also to be informed for certain, that if he can compass, as he pretends he can, to make a hole, which should reach to the center of the earth, where probably he wants to hide himself thro' shame of having advanced such nonsense, he will not be followed into his subterraneous recess farther than under the pole.

10°. To conclude, we beg that Doctor AKAKIA will prescribe some cooling ptisanes for him ; we likewise exhort him to study in some university, and there to behave himself modestly.

IF ever any mathematicians should be sent towards *Finland*, to rectify, if possible, by measurement, what NEWTON has discovered by his sublime theory of gravitation; and if he should be appointed one of the company, let him not seek every opportunity of raising himself above his companions; let him not be so vain as to have his picture drawn in the attitude of a man flattening the earth by himself, as ATLAS is painted supporting the heavens, just as if the whole system of the universe had been changed, because he had been to divert himself in a town where there is a Swedish garrison; let him not upon every occasion, whether to the purpose or not, mention the polar circle.

IF any of his comrades should propose in a friendly manner a different opinion from his, if he should have the confidence to tell him that he builds upon the authority of LEIBNITZ, and some other philosophers, if he should
parit-

particularly shew him a letter of LEIBNITZ, and formally contradict our young student, let him not imagine, without any reflexion, nor publish to all the world, that his comrade has forged a letter of LEIBNITZ to rob him of the glory of being an original.

LET him not boast of the error into which he is fallen, in regard to a point of dynamics absolutely of no use in practice, as of an admirable discovery.

IF this comrade, after having communicated his work to him several times, in which he opposes his opinion with great politeness and discretion, and even with encomiums upon him, should print it by his consent, let him take care not to censure this work afterwards as a crime of academical high treason.

IF this comrade has acknowledged to him several times that he was possessed of the letter of LEIBNITZ, as well as several others of a person deceased, let
not

not the young student convert them to malicious purposes; let him not make use of almost the same artifices as a certain person did against the MAIRANS, the CASSINI's, and other real philosophers; let him not in a frivolous dispute require that a man should rise from the dead to prove, for no manner of purpose, a very small hand in one of LEIBNITZ's letters, but let him reserve this miracle for the time he intends to prophesy; let him not bring other people into question in a silly quarrel which his vanity would fain render important; and let him not make the Gods interpose in a war of rats and frogs: let him not write letters upon letters to a great princess to compel his adversary to be silent, and to tie up his hands in order to assassinate him at his leisure.

LET him not, in a wretched dispute about dynamics, shew his academical bravery in summoning a professor to
appear

appear before him within a month; let him not cause him to be out-lawed as a person that has made an attempt upon his glory, as a forger of letters and as an impostor, especially when it is evident that the letters attributed to *Leibnitz* are really that great man's, and it is fully proved that the letters under the name of a president, were no more received from his correspondents, than read by the public.

LET him not endeavour to deprive any man of the liberty of making a just defence; let him reflect that a person who is in the wrong, and has a mind to disgrace him who is in the right, disgraces himself.

LET him believe that all men of letters are equal, and he shall gain by that equality.

LET him never think of insisting that nothing be printed without his order.

WE finish with exhorting him to enter rather into serious studies than
vain

vain cabals; for what a man of literature gains by intrigue, he loses in point of genius, just as in mechanics, what is gained in time is lost in force. We have seen but too many instances of young people, who have begun with giving great hopes from their ingenious compositions, and have finished at length with writing nothing but stuff and nonsense, because they wanted to be great courtiers instead of being able writers, because they substituted vanity in the place of study, and dissipation, which debilitates the understanding to reflection which strengthens it; they have been praised, and they have ceased to be praise worthy; they have been rewarded; and they have ceased to merit rewards; they wanted to make a figure; and they lost even their existence; for when a *sum* of errors in an author is equal to a *sum* of impertinences, *non-entity is equal to his existence.*

F I N I S.